

REMARKS

The present application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated January 9, 2006, and reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

A petition for a three-month extension of time accompanies this response together with the appropriate fee. Accordingly, the deadline for responding to the Office Action has been extended until July 10, 2006 (July 9 being a Sunday), and this response is therefore timely filed since it was deposited in the mail for First Class Delivery Service on the date certified on the front page hereof.

It is noted that the restriction requirement has still been deemed proper and the restriction requirement has therefore been made final. Applicant is presently considering filing a divisional application on the non-elected subject matter of claims 1-3.

The title of the invention has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Similarly, the abstract has been amended as suggested in the Office Action.

Reconsideration of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested. The objection is based on the components 1, 2, 3 and 4 illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, for example. The confusion appears to emanate from the specification which has been amended to clearly state that components 1, 2, 3 and 4 comprise a motion detector, a flashing unit, an infrared or other type sensor or detector, and an infrared or other form of emitter, respectfully. Also, the specification has been amended to clearly identify M1 as a mirror sensor strip in a consistent manner.

Claims 4, 8 and 11-18 have been amended to recite a clear antecedent for the lighting means. Similarly claims 7 and 10 have been amended to recite a clear antecedent basis for the window means. As amended all of these claims are believed to be in proper form.

The allowability of claims 9 and 10 is noted with appreciation.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-8, 11 and 13-21 define an illumination system which is neither shown nor suggested by the prior art. Specifically these claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Pearsall et al US 4,775,919 ("Pearsall"), for the following reasons.

Fundamentally, Pearsall discloses a light wheel cover with a self contained generator for producing current that energizes an array of light emitting diodes (LEDs) on the cover. The generator includes coils connected to rotate with a vehicle wheel and a plurality of magnets that independently rotate, the magnets being arranged next to the coils. The difference of rotational speed of the coils and the magnets produces the current that energizes the LEDs. The system is self contained and simply operates without any variation as the vehicle wheel rotates.

The illumination system of the present invention is different from Pearsall in its construction and in its operation. As recited in claim 4, the system includes lighting means and control means which are substantially stationary with respect to the rotation of the vehicle wheel. Windows in the housing direct lighting from the lighting means onto the vehicle wheel, and the control means is constructed and arranged to flash the lighting means at a frequency related to the rotational speed of the wheel.

Paragraph 83 of the specification at page 20 explains the relationship of the lighting means and the control means relative to the rotation of the vehicle wheel. As indicated these components remain stationary or relatively so even when the vehicle is moving.

No such relationship is found in Pearsall and instead all of the components rotate with the coils rotating at the same speed as the vehicle wheel and the magnets rotating at a lesser speed, but nevertheless purposely rotating.

The batteries 276, 278 of the present invention are offset, and the off set weight thereof is sufficient to prevent rotation while enabling the bearings 290, 292 to rotate around the shaft 288.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's dismissal of the structural features recited in claims 6 and 7. These spaced apart spokes with spaces therebetween function to cooperate with the other components of the illumination system to produce an overall affect which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Pearsall.

Also, the ultraviolet radiation recited in claim 17 and the infrared radiation recited in claim 18 do not comprise obvious matters of design choice. Use of such radiation enables indicia on the vehicle tire to be generally invisible during daylight operation of the vehicle. However, with the ultraviolet and infrared radiation such invisible indicia during daylight operation becomes visible during nighttime operation when the illumination system is energized.

Claim 13 defines a magnet that rotates with the housing and a magnetic sensor on the control means for determining the rotation speed of the vehicle wheel. No such feature is addressed by Pearsall and is improper to rely upon the power generation

system of Pearsall which primarily includes the coils and magnets. In the present invention, the subject matter of claim 13 precisely determines the rotational speed of the vehicle wheel and eliminates any possible unwanted effects caused by outside interferences factors.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion that the subject matter of claims 14, 15 and 16 simply involves design choice. These features have nothing to do with discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable and instead they produce a unique pattern or design which is purposely engineered into the illumination system of the present invention.

Newly presented claim 21 recites the important feature of the present invention where a remote control accessible to the vehicle driver is connected to energize and deenergize the system and to alter the flashing of the lighting means. Pearsall is totally silent and unsuggestive of any such remote control for any purpose.

Accordingly, for the reasons noted above it is believed that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Richard M. Beck

Registration No.: 22,580
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

475007